



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

26

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,364	06/23/2005	Karl Weinhold	3988-051799	3482
28289	7590	01/30/2007	EXAMINER	
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			BOCHNA, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3679	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/540,364	WEINHOLD, KARL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David E. Bochna	3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 20-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 20-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the subject matter of claim 30 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 21, 23, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 21 recites the limitation "the clamping lever" in lines 1-2 and "the free circumferential end" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3679

6. Claim 23, it is unclear how the ring clamp can be a unitary piece when claim 1 recites that the ring clamp includes at least two partial shells.

7. Claim 31 recites the limitation "the ridges" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 35 recites the limitation "the clamping lever" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 20, 24, 26, 28-29, 31-34 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikegami et al. '510.

In regard to claim 20, Ikegami et al. discloses a coupling 2 for a spiral wire flexible hose, wherein the coupling comprising:

a ring clamp 2 configured as a clamping jaw and including at least two partial shells 2a, 2b enclosing a sleeve of the spiral wire flexible hose, wherein the ring clamp has an inner contour having a spiral 3 to receive a spiral wire flexible hose P in a positive locking engagement, wherein the hose is adapted to receive a spout 1 therein, wherein the spiral extends up to a protrusion 13 situated at the end of the ring clamp, whereby the spout is clamped such that the spout is axially immovable.

In regard to claim 24, the spiral 3 is constructed from plastic.

In regard to claim 26, the spiral 3 has an essentially rectangular cross-section.

In regard to claim 28, the inner contour of the partial shells has concentric ridges 24.

In regard to claim 29, the inner contour of the partial shells has interspaced ridges 24.

In regard to claim 31, one of the ridges 24 has a triangular cross-section.

In regard to claim 32, the spout has a flange 13 configured as an annular flange and the partial shells have an annular groove 23 inside the clamping jaw provided to accommodate the annular flange.

In regard to claims 33 and 34, (these claims are considered intended use claims, as claim 20 is drawn only to the coupling and not to the hose and spout. Specifically claim 20 recites a coupling “for a spiral wire flexible hose...wherein the hose is adapted to receive a spout therein”. Therefore the claim is only drawn to the coupling with the intended use of it being used on a hose with a spout) the spout has an annular groove wherein an O-ring is situated in the area over which the sleeve end of the spiral wire flexible hose is situated (the coupling 2 of Ikegami et al. is capable of receiving a spout with a groove and seal and therefore anticipates the intended use recited in this claim).

In regard to claim 37, the ridges 24 have a triangular cross-section.

In regard to claim 38, the ridges 24 have a triangular cross-section.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3679

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 21, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikegami in view of Loker.

In regard to claim 21, Ikegami et al. discloses a coupling as described above, that is designed to be easily assembled. However, Ikegami et al. does not disclose that the coupling includes a lever and spring to join the two halves of the ring clamp. Loker teaches that providing a clamping ring with either a bolted connection (fig. 2) or a clamping lever that is attached to a end of a partial shell 111 via a bolt, and may be connected via a recoil spring (strap near where 107 is pointing) to the other free circumferential end of the corresponding partial shell 107 are well known equivalents in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the bolted connection of Ikegami et al. with a clamping lever connection, as taught by Loker, because inasmuch as the references disclose these elements as art recognized equivalents, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the exercise art to substitute one for the other. In re Fout, 675 F.2d 297, 301, 213 USPQ 532, 536 (CCPA 1982).

In regard to claim 35, Loker does not disclose the exact material of the clamping lever. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the lever out of stainless steel because the selection of a known material based upon its suitability for the intended use is a design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

13. Claims 22, 23, 25, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikegami et al.

In regard to claims 22 and 25, Ikegami et al. does not disclose the exact material of the ring clamp and spiral. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the ring out of plastic and spiral out of a conductive material because the selection of a known material based upon its suitability for the intended use is a design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

In regard to claim 23, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the ring unitary instead of split because one-piece construction, in place of separate elements fastened together, is a design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Kohno, 391 F.2d 959, 157 USPQ 275 (CCPA 1968); In re Larson, 340 F.2d 965, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965).

In regard to claims 27 and 30, Ikegami et al. does not disclose the spiral includes a centrally located ridge-like protrusion or that the ridges on the inner contour of the shells are a plurality of peg like projections. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the spiral with protrusions, or the interior ridges in the shape of peg like projections because a change in the shape of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

14. Claim 36 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Schwarz et al., Merrett, Kresss, Matsui et al., Weinhold, Borsh et al., Currie, Goodall, Japanese Patent 3,199,797, UK Application 2,180,904, and French Publication 2,645,616 all disclose similar couplings common in the art.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Bochna whose telephone number is (571) 272-7078. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on (571) 272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
David E. Bochna  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3679